



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/686,641

10/10/2000

Parul A. Mittal

JP920000234US1

5887

21954

7590

06/29/2010

HARRY A SNYDER

800 E BENTON

CARROLLTON, MO 64633

EXAMINER

CARLSON, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3622

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/29/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/686,641  
Filing Date: October 10, 2000  
Appellant(s): MITTAL ET AL.

Mohammad S. Rahman  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 1/11/07 appealing from the Office action mailed 10/21/04. Additionally, this is in response to the Director ordered remand under 37 CFR 41.35(c) from the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences mailed 6/8/10.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct. However to clarify, claims 1-61 were rejected in the final office action mailed 10/21/04.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is substantially correct. However, because the examiner agreed that the after final amendments would be entered upon appeal, the claim scope has changed somewhat since the final rejection. Although Official Notice was taken previously (and now represented by newly cited references), it was not taken on subject matter present in every claim. In addition, there are two New Grounds of Rejection discussed below:

**NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION**

Claims 20-24 and 26-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim(s) 1, 7, 10, 13, 18, 39, 45, 48, 51, and 56 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,513,016	FREENY, JR.	1-2003
5,890,138	GODIN ET AL	3-1999
6,497,360	SCHULZE, JR.	12-2002
5,857,175	DAY ET AL	1-1999

Hirshleifer, "Price theory and applications", second edition, Prentice Hall, 1980, pps 132-135.

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

**Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, 20-24, 27, 28, 31, 36, 37, 39-43, 46, 47, 50, 55, 56, 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny, Jr (US6513016) in view of Godin et al (US5890138) and Schulze, Jr. (US6497360).**

Regarding claims 1, 4, 5, 20, 23, 24, 39, 42, 43, Freeny, Jr teaches a computerized system that monitors sales, demand and inventory supply and dynamically adjusts pricing. The system enables advertising/promotional pricing using coupons that can be printed for customers and redeemed. The coupon system generates coupons that are dynamically priced as determined by the system [abstract, 4:4-11, 6:32-37, 7:35-37, 11:16-27]. The coupon system is taken to be electronic as the coupon data is stored on the computer and can be electronically changed. Further, the coupons include UPC codes which are electronically scanned upon redemption. While Freeny, Jr teaches different sales data sources as inputs to the price determination system, he does not teach the use of auction data. Godin et al teaches an online computer auction system which is used to sell goods. Godin et al

Art Unit: 3622

teaches that a benefit of the auctions is the ability to track the price/demand nature of the product.

This provides valuable information to the manufacturer. Instead of detailed testing, businesses can use auction data to determine price and demand information for specified products and a price demand curve can be created [7:60-8:5]:

(19) Another feature of the auction system is the ability ***to track the price demand nature of the product. This provides valuable marketing information to the manufacturer.*** For example, in trying to determine the response at different prices, companies have to conduct various tests. In contrast ***with the auction system as shown a lot of information regarding price and demand is immediately known.*** The relationship between this type of purchasers and the average purchaser can then be applied to provide a conventional price demand curve for the particular product. ***It can readily be appreciated that the computer system provides the demand price curve.***

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have looked to any source of pricing/demand data as an input to the system of Freeny, Jr, including the auction-based data of Godin et al in order to create promotional pricing based upon a rich collection of price/demand data thereby creating more effective promotional pricing. Regarding the auction-related parameters comprising “non-quantitative attributes,” Godin et al teaches the collection and storage of user data such as name, address, city, province, postal code, email address, telephone. This data is used in the online auction process. Each of these is taken to be a “non-quantitative attribute of a bidder.” While postal code and telephone fields each comprise numeric digits, the data is numeric code representing qualitative information such as the general area of location (area code) or more specific area of location (postal code). Area codes and postal codes are often classified as demographic data and are taken to be qualitative. Even though this data is stored using digits, the information is not quantitative and it would never be used in arithmetic calculations as quantitative values (such as price, tax rates, etc) would be. Nonetheless, a person’s name is clearly non-quantitative and represents a cultural attribute of that person. A person’s city is non-quantitative and represents a cultural attribute of that person. Culture is such a broad term that any characteristic can

Art Unit: 3622

be used to define a “culture”; the types of people using American Express cards can be said to belong to a credit card culture different than Visa card holders. The type of credit card is non-quantitative data. The “for getting market information” language found in system claim 1 is taken to be functional language and intended use and does not provide a positive limitation. Nonetheless, the combination provides an auction process and system for getting market information (price/demand data) so that promotional pricing can be dynamically created in the form of coupons. This creation of and reliance upon the price-demand relationship is taken to provide a “statistical” means for generating discount coupons (discount is a promotion scheme parameter) for different market segments where each product or product type represents a market segment. Neither Freeny, Jr. nor Godin et al appear to teach the feedback of coupon redemption data in order to “learn, adapt and improve” the system. Schulze, Jr teaches an electronic coupon promotional system where coupon redemption data is used as an input to the coupon system in order to provide a feedback loop to improve the system [abstract]:

Method and apparatus for accurately ***collecting and promptly reporting information in connection with the redemption of manufacturer coupons*** are provided. The method includes the collection of information from a retailer point-of-sale system, and ***the examination of redeemed coupons***. Where matches between product sales, discounts to consumers and redeemed coupons can be made, payment to the retailer of discounts extended to consumers in exchange for manufacturer authorized coupons is immediately made following such verification. In addition, ***information concerning the redemption of coupons is made available to manufacturers to enable them to adjust promotions to achieve the desired marketing effect***. The apparatus of the present invention may comprise a central processing unit and attached peripherals capable of interfacing with a retailer point-of-sale system and downloading information from the point-of-sale system, together with secure storage for holding coupons that are to be verified by the apparatus.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have fed back the results of the coupon system of Freeny, Jr/Godin et al as a closed loop system in order to improve results and provide a system that “learns” in a manner as desired by Schulze, Jr.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 17, 21, 22, 36, 40, 41, 55, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have electronically captured valuable auction data input

for any well known auction types (applicant and Godin et al recognize the prior existence of various auction types such as Dutch auction, reverse auction, etc), so as to base pricing on a wide range of data in an automated manner.

Regarding claims 8, 27, 46, promotion coupon and advertising campaigns typically include such claimed parameters and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have provided them in order to provide an effective promotion.

Regarding claims 9, 28, 47, the auction data represents a population of consumers who have interest in a product and would pay at least zero price for it – uninterested people do not bid. The purchases (winning bids) represent points on the price-demand curves and each purchase helps tell the story about the quantity or demand at each of those prices. These winning bids represent the fraction of all bids and are taken to represent fractional demand (number of purchases divided by all those interested). A product of (this fraction of the bidders who win) X (the interested population) = the number of winners or purchases – this value is taught by the combination simply by the notion to create a price-demand curve.

Regarding claims 12, 31, 50, plural auctions for different products inherently define different segments based on the product type. A marketer could define segments in any imaginable way for a plurality of products.

Regarding claims 18, 37, 56, selecting and providing the suggested auction-data input to the computerized pricing system functionality in order to output pricing decision and actions is taken to allow a user to “configure” the data sources. The user implementing/building/programming the system of Godin et al determines which bidder data fields are required to use the auction system.

Regarding claim 58, the system is taken to inherently “learn” about online markets by mining information from current and past operations of similar online markets.

Regarding claim 59, Freeny, Jr teaches that the system monitors inventory levels and can adjust pricing accordingly. This is taken to provide optimal inventory management.

Regarding claims 60, the proposed combination provides an online electronic coupon generation system.

Regarding claim 61, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have sold the valuable marketing research to other firms so that they may use the same techniques to price, promote and sell their products.

**Claims 7, 14-16, 26, 33-35, 45, 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny, Jr (US6513016) in view of Godin et al (US5890138), Schulze, Jr. (US6497360) and Hirshleifer (“Price theory and applications”, second edition, Prentice Hall, 1980, pps 132-135.)**

Regarding claims 7, 16, 26, 35, 45, 54, the combination proposed above contemplates the use of auction data in order to analyze the price-demand relationship in order to trigger price changes via coupon discounts. Hirshleifer teaches optimal pricing analysis using price-demand curves. The slope of the demand curve reveals the relationship between price and demand, however the units of measurement used for price and demand affect the overall magnitude of the slope. Hirshleifer in particular teaches the need for studying the “price elasticity” which is the proportional change in quantity demanded divided by the proportional change in price [pps 132-133] which enables one to study the relative relationships without consideration for the measurement units. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have studied the *elasticity* of demand by studying the proportional changes of quantity vs. price as suggested by Hirshleifer. The coupons triggered by Freeny, Jr. are taken to represent a determination that a product is “amenable to price discrimination”. The auction/sales data used (representing many transactions) is taken to represent a



Art Unit: 3622

plurality of data sources. Further, the price demand curves inherently associate quantities demanded and price, for a collection of individual buyers.

Regarding claims 14, 33, 52, using auction data as sales data as an input into Freeny, Jr.'s system is taken to provide including winning bids in all of the auctions. The highest bids of all the bidders is taken to be the winning bids.

Regarding claims 15, 34, 53, the demand curves taught by Freeny, Jr are based on the results of the sales for a plurality of products and a plurality of quantities.

**Claims 10, 11, 13, 29, 30, 32, 48, 49, 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freeny, Jr (US6513016) in view of Godin et al (US5890138), Schulze, Jr. (US6497360) and Day et al (US5857175).** Day et al teaches that it is generally well known for retailers or manufacturers to offer coupons in order to encourage switching from a competitors brand (such switching is taken to also provide on product substitution as in claim 10) or to encourage quantity purchases (taken to be “up selling”). Such would have been obvious to have employed with the combination in order to accomplish particularly desired sales.

#### **NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION -- 35 USC § 101**

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 20-24 and 26-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court precedent a method claim must (1) be tied to another statutory class of invention (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing (see at least

Art Unit: 3622

*Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)). A method claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. Here claims 20-24 and 26-37 fail to meet the above requirements.

**NEW GROUND(S) OF REJECTION -- 35 USC § 112**

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim(s) 1, 7, 10, 13, 18, 39, 45, 48, 51, and 56 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, ¶ 2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 39 recite the following means (or step) plus function limitations:

means for automatically obtaining market demand data from defined sources of online auctions

means for conducting online actions using defined parameters for specified goods and/or services for getting market information

means for storing and analyzing the data obtained from said online auctions or said conducted auctions to estimate demand and calculate promotion scheme parameters for issue of redeemable electronic coupons

means for generating said redeemable electronic coupons

Claims 7 and 45 recite the following means (or step) plus function limitations:

means for estimating the market demand curve and the price elasticity for an auction item or product or service for a plurality of demand data sources

means for determining if an item or product or service is amenable to price discrimination based on said estimated demand curve and price elasticity

Claims 10 and 48 recite the following means (or step) plus function limitations:

means for suggesting the discounting of a substitute of the product or item or service being auctioned

Claims 13 and 51 recite the following means (or step) plus function limitations:

means for suggesting discounting of a cross selling or an up selling product to the product being auctioned

Claims 18 and 56 recite the following means (or step) plus function limitations:

means for the user to configure the sources of online demand data as well as the parameters for conducting online auctions on a plurality of products on specified URLs

These limitations invoke 35 USC § 112, ¶ 6 because they meet the 3-prong analysis set forth in MPEP 2181 as it recites the phrase “means for” or “step for” (or appellant identifies the limitation as a means (or step) plus function limitation in the appeal brief) and the phrase is modified by functional language and it is not modified by sufficient structure, material, or acts for performing the recited function. Also see *Altiris Inc. v. Semantec Corp.*, 318 F.3d 1363, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2003). 35 USC § 112, ¶ 6, requires such claim to be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof. “If one employs means plus function language in a claim, one must set forth in the specification an adequate disclosure showing what is meant by that language. If an applicant fails to set forth an adequate disclosure, the applicant has in effect failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention as required by the second

paragraph of section § 112.” In re Donaldson Co., 16 F.3d 1189, 1195, 29 USPQ 1845, 1850 (Fed. Cir. 1994)(in banc.). For a computer-implemented means-plus-function claim limitation that invokes 35 USC § 112, ¶ 6, the corresponding structure is required to be more than simply a general purpose computer. Aristocrat Technologies, Inc. v. International Game Technology, 521 F.3d 1328, 1333, 86 USPQ2d 1235, 1239-40 (Fed. Cir. 2008). The corresponding structure for a computer-implemented function must include the algorithm as well as the general purpose computer. WMS Gaming, Inc. v. International Game Technology, 184 F.3d 1339, 51 USPQ2d 1385 (Fed. Cir. 1999). The written description must at least disclose the algorithm that transforms the general purpose microprocessor to a special purpose computer programmed to perform the claimed function. Aristocrat, 521 F.3d at 1338, 86 USPQ2d at 1242.

In the instant application, the following portions of the specification and drawings may appear to describe the corresponding structure for performing the claimed function:

Claims 1 and 39: page 14 line 3-13; page 15 lines 15-23; page 16 lines 5-6; page 20 line 5; Fig. 1 elements 1 and 4.

Claims 7 and 45: page 14 line 21 to 15 line 9.

Claims 10 and 48: page 16 line 23 to page 17 line 11.

Claims 13 and 51: page 18 lines 4-14.

Claims 18 and 56: page 20 lines 1-10.

However, the specification and drawings do not disclose sufficient corresponding structure, material or acts for performing the claimed function.

As per claims 1 and 39, page 14 line 3, page 16 lines 5-6, page 20 line 5, and Fig 1 element 1, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides examples as “obtains demand data from online auctions (1) for a desired product or service”, “[t]he system then obtains the demand data from the configured URLs by observing the ongoing on-line auction. The system can set

Art Unit: 3622

up software agents to start capturing the demand data from the time that the auction starts to the time it ends.”, and “[t]he system can also be configured to conduct auctions on a plurality of products on configured URLs for a specified duration, reserve price and other auction-specific configurations”, and does not show a structure or algorithm for obtaining market demand data from defined sources of online auctions. Figure 1:1 is simply a caption “Demand data from online auctions (1)” and portrays no underlying structure.

As per claims 1 and 39, page 15 lines 15-23, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides examples as “[m]arket segment is defined by a plurality of multi-valued attributes such as the demographic parameters like age group, sex, marital status, household income hobbies or the geographic parameters like city state and country. Some of these attributes may be non-quantitative and hence fuzzy, e.g. time of the day, the season, bidder's cultural upbringing, etc. In India for example, there is a concept of 'boni' which is the money earned on the first transaction of every day. It is believed that once the 'boni' occurs, the rest of the day will be fruitful. Thus it is usually seen that the merchants accept lower prices in beginning of day to get the 'boni' and hence the customers mind-set is also to pay a lower price.”, and “[t]he system can also be configured to conduct auctions on a plurality of products on configured URLs for a specified duration, reserve price and other auction-specific configurations”, and does not show a structure or algorithm for conducting online actions using defined parameters for specified goods and/or services for getting market information. Although this portion of the Specification provides some guidelines for special cases such as cultural differences, it still provides no description of a structure or algorithm to perform the operation.

As per claims 1 and 39, page 14 lines 4-13 and Fig. 1, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides examples as “stores and analyses the received data and produces promotion scheme parameters (3), as an output to an electronic coupon generation system (4). The output from the electronic coupon generation system (4) is also fed back as an input to the 'dynamic online estimator' (2) to provide feedback in order to dynamically learn, adapt and improve the generation of promotional parameters. The said feedback is the change in the product sales quantity during promotion or the number of new customers and the like.”, and does not show a structure or algorithm for storing and analyzing the data obtained from said online auctions or said conducted auctions to estimate demand and calculate promotion scheme parameters for issue of redeemable

electronic coupons. Figure 1 is simply a block diagram showing data flow between 2 blocks and shows no underlying structure or performing the storage or analysis.

As per claims 1 and 39, page 14 lines 5-6 and Fig. 1 element 4, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides examples as “stores and analyses the received data and produces promotion scheme parameters (3), as an output to an electronic coupon generation system (4).”, and does not show a structure or algorithm for generating said redeemable electronic coupons. Figure 1:4 is simply a block with the caption “Electronic Coupon System” and portrays no underlying structure.

As per claims 7 and 45, page 14 line 21 through page 15 line 2, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides theoretical examples as “[t]he estimator (2) estimates the market demand curve and the price elasticity for an auctioned item, a product or a service, from each individual auction's data. The market demand curve is the response of a collective of potential buyers to changes in price. It determines if the item is amenable to price discrimination based on the demand curve and the price elasticity information from a plurality of auctions data”, and does not show a structure or algorithm for estimating the market demand curve and the price elasticity for an auction item or product or service for a plurality of demand data sources.

As per claims 7 and 45, page 15 lines 3-9, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides some underlying theory as “it is well recognized that price discrimination is successful in markets that are segmented with each segment having distinct price elasticity. So if the demand data is from a plurality of market segments and different segments have distinct price elasticities, it outputs the promotion scheme parameters for each market segment. Even if the data were from the same market segment, if the demand curve suggested a large increase in item sales for a small price drop, promotion scheme parameters are suggested accordingly.”, and does not show a structure or algorithm for determining if an item or product or service is amenable to price discrimination based on said estimated demand curve and price elasticity.

As per claims 10 and 48, page 16 line 23 through page 17 line 11, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides theoretical examples as “Figure 2 shows another embodiment of this invention in which the system is used to identify a comparative substitute of the product being auctioned as a target for promotion using e-coupons. The demand data from the online auctions (5) is used to estimate a demand curve (6) and estimate price elasticity (7) for the auctioned products. If the price elasticity obtained suggests price discrimination (8) then a

Art Unit: 3622

competitive substitute is identified (9) for which promotion parameters for the e-coupon scheme are generated (10). If the price elasticity does not suggest any price discrimination, the promotion scheme is not generated (11). Usually the increase in demand is due to brand switching rather than more buying as discussed by S. Gupta in "Impact of Sales Promotion on When, What, and How Much to Buy, Journal of Marketing Research, 25, 203-238, 1988. Thus a manufacturer can use this system to obtain the demand curve of a competitor's product and then discount its own substitute product accordingly", and does not show a structure or algorithm for suggesting the discounting of a substitute of the product or item or service being auctioned.

As per claims 13 and 51, page 18 lines 4-14, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides theoretical examples as "the system suggests that a cross selling or an up-selling product of the product being auctioned should be discounted. A cross-selling product is different from the product being sold but is associated with it. For example, a table to keep a computer is a cross-selling product of the computer. An up-selling product on the other hand is closer to being an accessory of the product being sold or related to the product being sold. For example, a printer is an up-selling product to a computer. Thus a manufacturer can use this system to obtain the demand curve of a product and then discount items that are cross-selling or up-selling. The idea is to offer a combination of products at the price where the demand is high by discounting the cross-selling product rather than the original product", and does not show a structure or algorithm for suggesting discounting of a cross selling or an up selling product to the product being auctioned.

As per claims 18 and 56, page 20 lines 1-10, this portion of the Specification merely repeats the function and provides theoretical examples as "[t]he system then obtains the demand data from the configured URLs by observing the ongoing on-line auction. The system can set up software agents to start capturing the demand data from the time that the auction starts to the time it ends. The system can also be configured to conduct auctions on a plurality of products on configured URLs for a specified duration, reserve price and other auction-specific configurations", and does not show a structure or algorithm for the user to configure the sources of online demand data as well as the parameters for conducting online auctions on a plurality of products on specified URLs.

As such, Appellant has failed to adequately describe sufficient structure for performing the functions claimed.

**(10) Response to Argument**

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

The "motivation-suggestion-teaching" test asks not merely what the references disclose, but whether a person of ordinary skill in the art, possessed with the understandings and knowledge reflected in the prior art, and motivated by the general problem facing the inventor, would have been led to make the combination recited in the claims. See *In re Leonard R. Kahn* (CAFC, 04-1616, 3/22/2006).

References are selected as being reasonably pertinent to the problem based on the judgment of a person having ordinary skill in the art. Id. ("[I]t is necessary to consider 'the reality of the circumstances,'-in other words, common sense-in deciding in which fields a person of ordinary skill would reasonably be expected to look for a solution to the problem facing the inventor." (quoting *In re Wood*, 599 F.2d 1032, 1036 (C.C.P.A. 1979)).

Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill represents an Information Systems programmer. Examiner believes that at the time of the invention, an ordinarily skilled individual in such an area could have an MBA as well as programming skills. This was a common mix of skills at the time of the invention. Further, even an individual with ordinary business skills who lacked the needed programming skills would have found it obvious and would have capably assembled the necessary functionality of such a business system. "As a general rule, where software constitutes part of a best mode of carrying out an invention, description of such a best mode is satisfied by a disclosure of the



functions of the software. This is because, normally, writing code for such software is within the skill of the art, not requiring undue experimentation, once its functions have been disclosed. . . . [F]low charts or source code listings are not a requirement for adequately disclosing the functions of software." *Fonar Corp.*, 107 F.3d at 1549, 41 USPQ2d at 1805.

Applicant argues that one of ordinary skill would not be capable of arranging a system that accessed different auction *sites*. Applicant's claim 2 does not require the auction types to be from different sites, but rather simply different *types*. Further, applicant argues the disclosure of collecting auction data from various auctions from their start to end as an "overwhelming achievement" beyond one of ordinary skill. However, the pertinent disclosure (spec, page 18, 3<sup>rd</sup> ¶) merely states the desire to collect information from different types of auctions – there is no particular disclosure regarding any details of how this is accomplished. Examiner did not raise enablement issues regarding this disclosure for the reason that one of ordinary skill would be capable of collecting this data and feeding it into the system using routine experimentation.

Freeny, Jr teaches the use of sales data as input to a dynamic pricing system. Godin et al teaches that auction sales data is quite valuable for creating marketing information because demand-price curves can be created from the raw sales data. One of ordinary skill would have recognized the value in providing auction sales data as an input to the dynamic pricing system of Freeny, Jr. One of ordinary skill contemplating Freeny, Jr's automatic dynamic coupon pricing system would also have recognized the benefits of feeding back the coupon redemption data into the automatic and dynamic pricing system so as to enable the system to adapt in the same manner as proposed by Schulze, Jr.

Applicant argues that Godin et al does not teach non-quantitative attributes comprising cultural attributes of bidders. Cultural is such a broad term and many levels of "culture" can be said to exist for different types of people. Applicant acknowledges that Godin et al relies on information such as credit card number, user's names, address and email address for the auction system, yet

Art Unit: 3622

applicant inexplicitly labels these as “quantitative”. Yes, the credit card number is made up of digits, but such a number is (at least in part) a collection of meaningful codes. Further, no mathematical operations are done on credit card numbers. Same reasoning applies for a user’s email or address – numbers may be present, but this data is surely non-quantitative. [jsmith27@yahoo.com](mailto:jsmith27@yahoo.com) is non-quantitative. Applicant has failed to provide any sound reasoning to show otherwise. This limitation is present in Godin et al as detailed above. Applicant argues further that none of the bidder attributes are used to provide targeted advertising. Applicant’s claims only require the non-quantitative attributes to be used when conducting auctions – they are never put to use by the claims subsequent to the auction process. The “for getting market information” language of claim 1 is taken to be functional language and intended use and does not provide a positive limitation. Nonetheless, the combination provides an auction process and system for getting market information (price/demand data) so that promotional pricing can be dynamically created in the form of coupons. There is no linkage in the claims between the bidder’s cultural attributes and the generated coupons, although applicant appears to argue such a requirement. Lastly, cultural attributes of bidders are believed to be present in the auction system as explained above. For example, auction bidders buying antique clocks certainly represent a different culture of bidders compared to those bidding on skateboards – each cultural group having “patterns of knowledge, belief and behavior” consistent with applicant’s provided exemplary definition from Merriam-Webster’s.

Applicant argues that the art does not teach coupon parameters for market segments. As stated in the action, a product promoted by a discount coupon is taken to represent a market segment. While a product is taken to represent a product market segment in itself, purchasers of products such as infant formula also can be said to represent a market segment.

Applicant argues that Freeny, Jr provides a pricing system based on purchasing trends, yet the claimed invention uses market data to establish coupon parameters. Applicant continues by stating

that the establishment of pricing structures for various goods is a different concept than generating coupons based on market demand. Examiner frankly fails to see any particular differences. Freney, Jr's sales data provides demand data (POS market data) which is used to establish coupon-based pricing.

Applicant argues with respect to claim 17 that while Godin et al references dutch auctions, he does not state that his system can work with dutch auctions. Applicant argues that Godin et al merely references different auction types rather than teaches them to be used. The types of auctions claimed are both well known and recognized by Godin et al. One of ordinary skill would have found it obvious to have included demand data from any well known style of auction including those as claimed.

Applicant argues that none teach the elements of claim 3, yet provides no specific reasoning why the examiner's rejection is deficient.

Regarding claim 5, applicant argues that the art fails to teach opening price and decrements. The claim does not positively require Dutch auctions to be present – “in the case of” is taken to introduce essentially optional language. Further however, these known elements of dutch auctions are captured in order to conduct such an auction and would have been obvious to have analyzed as demand data, although the claim does not require these features to be relied upon in the pricing analysis.

Applicant argues that the taking of Official Notice must be supported by evidence. Examiner took Official Notice in an action previous to the final action which went unchallenged in applicant's response of 6/28/2004. Applicant's point that the examiner failed to seize the opportunity and present evidence with the Advisory Action of 1/7/2005 appears to be moot without any seasonable challenge having been presented. Nonetheless, examiner has further provided evidence and

Art Unit: 3622

integrated it into the rejections previously made of record so as to fill in the gaps of the applied evidence.

Examiner has corrected his statement that Freeny, Jr teaches price elasticity based on the results of the “auctions” – indeed the examiner has consistently held that Freeny, Jr does not teach auctions, but rather “sales” data.

As stated above with regard to “fractional demand” of claim 9, the auction data proposed represents a population of consumers who have interest in a product and would pay at least zero price for it – uninterested people do not bid. The purchases (winning bids) represent points on the price-demand curves and each purchase helps tell the story about the quantity or demand at each of those prices. These winning bids represent the fraction of all bids and are taken to represent fractional demand (number of purchases divided by all those interested). A product of (this fraction of the bidders who win) X (the interested population) = the number of winners or purchases – this value is taught by the combination simply by the notion to create a price-demand curve.

Applicant argues that none teach the elements of claim 18, yet provides no specific reasoning why the examiner’s rejection is deficient.

Applicant argues (claim 8) that the combination does not address market segments. As stated earlier, a product promoted by a discount coupon is taken to represent a market segment. While a product is taken to represent a product market segment in itself, purchasers of products such as infant formula also can be said to represent a market segment.

Applicant argues (claim 58) that the art fails to learn about online markets by mining information. Examiner continues to assert inherency. The history of online auction data to be used with Freeny, Jr’s system provides mining of online market information whereby the dynamic pricing component learns what price to output. Further, the inclusion of Schulze, Jr. to use coupons redemption data as feedback to improve the system provides further learning.

Applicant argues (claim 59) that “optimal inventory management” does not refer to price adjustments according to inventory levels. Examiner believes the teachings of the combination meet the claim language as reasonably interpreted. Applicant’s alternate examples of “optimal inventory management” which presumably are lacking in the combination do not prevent the noted features in the art from being an example within the scope claim language.

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

This examiner’s answer contains a new ground of rejection set forth in section **(9)** above. Accordingly, appellant must within **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this answer exercise one of the following two options to avoid *sua sponte* **dismissal of the appeal** as to the claims subject to the new ground of rejection:

**(1) Reopen prosecution.** Request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner by filing a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 with or without amendment, affidavit or other evidence. Any amendment, affidavit or other evidence must be relevant to the new grounds of rejection. A request that complies with 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1) will be entered and considered. Any request that prosecution be reopened will be treated as a request to withdraw the appeal.

**(2) Maintain appeal.** Request that the appeal be maintained by filing a reply brief as set forth in 37 CFR 41.41. Such a reply brief must address each new ground of rejection as set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii) and should be in compliance with the other requirements of 37 CFR 41.37(c). If a reply brief filed pursuant to 37 CFR 41.39(b)(2) is accompanied by any amendment,

Art Unit: 3622

affidavit or other evidence, it shall be treated as a request that prosecution be reopened before the primary examiner under 37 CFR 41.39(b)(1).

Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to the TWO MONTH time period set forth above. See 37 CFR 1.136(b) for extensions of time to reply for patent applications and 37 CFR 1.550(c) for extensions of time to reply for ex parte reexamination proceedings.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey D. Carlson/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622

Conferees:

Eric Stamber/E. W. S./  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3622

Vincent Millin /vm/  
Appeals Conference Specialist

**A Technology Center Director or designee must personally approve the new ground(s) of rejection set forth in section (9) above by signing below:**

**/Wynn W. Coggins/**

**Director, TC 3600**